



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SP
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/835,444	04/17/2001	Satoshi Kuroyanagi	35.G2788	5469
5514	7590	08/03/2005	EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112				PHILLIPS, HASSAN A
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2151		

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/835,444	KUROYANAGI, SATOSHI
	Examiner Hassan Phillips	Art Unit 2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,6-9,11,16-19,23,24,27,28,31 and 32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,6-9,11,16-19,23,24,27,28,31 and 32 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.



DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the request for continued examination filed on May 23, 2005, and amendments and remarks filed on April 14, 2005.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 23, 2005, has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed April 14, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant sustains the argument that: the applied art fails to disclose or suggest at least the feature that address book changes are denied for a remote access while a first guide display, which is operable by a local user to access data of the address book, is displayed on a local user interface, and address book changes are permitted for the remote access when the first guide display is not displayed on the local user interface.

In regards to Applicants arguments, Examiner sustains that the combination of AAPA and Johnson provide a means for address book changes to be denied for a

remote access while a first guide display, which is operable by a local user to access data of the address book, is displayed on a local user interface, and address book changes to be permitted for the remote access when the first guide display is not displayed on the local user interface. In Applicant's remarks Applicant's emphasize, "it is the access of the data of the address book, which may include a read operation, via the first guide display that serves as the basis for the denial or permission of address book changes by remote access." In contrast, the claims indicate denying address book changes when a guide display is displayed on a local user interface, not by accessing the data of the address book, which may include a read operation, via the first guide display. As indicated in the previous office actions, the write token has the same functionality as the claimed guide display since changes to data are denied from a second access means while a local user has the token, and changes are permitted from a second access means when the local user does not have the token, (Johnson, col. 6, lines 24-35). Furthermore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Johnson and AAPA, since both a display means for displaying a first guide on a local user interface, wherein the first guide display is operable by a local user to access data of an address book (AAPA, page 2, lines 4-6), and permitting or denying data changing requests for a first access means, or a second access means from devices on a network (Johnson, col. 6, lines 11-35), were well known in the art at the time of the invention.

Also, It is the Examiner's position that Applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed invention in a manner that distinguishes over the prior art.

Accordingly the references supplied by the examiner in the previous office action covers the claimed limitations. The rejections are thus sustained. Applicant is requested to review the prior art of record for further consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 6-9, 11, 16-19, 23, 24, 27, 28, 31, 32, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Johnson et al. (hereinafter Johnson), U.S. Patent 5,113,519.

6. In considering claims 1, 9, 11, 19, 23, 24, 31, and 32, the AAPA discloses a communication device having an address book storing data of communication destination, the communication device comprising: first access means for accessing data of the address book in response to operations of a local user interface, and a display means for displaying a first guide on the local user interface, wherein the first

guide display is operable by a local user to access data of the address book, (page 2, lines 4-6).

Although the AAPA shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to show: permitting or denying address book data changing requests from the first access means, or other devices on a network.

Nevertheless, permitting or denying data changing requests for a first access means, or a second access means from devices on a network was well known in the art at the time of the invention. This is exemplified by Johnson in a similar field of endeavor that teaches a distributed data processing system comprising: second access means for accessing data in response to requests from other devices on a network, (col. 6, lines 11-17); control means for deciding to permit or deny data changing requests from a first access means, and from the second access means, (col. 6, lines 24-35); and, the control means permitting changing the data from the second access means when the first access means does not have a write token, (col. 6, lines 24-35).

Thus, given the teachings of Johnson, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the AAPA to show second access means for accessing data in response to requests from other devices on a network, and a control means for deciding to permit or deny address book data changing requests from the second access means when the first guide display is displayed on the local user interface. This would have allowed for modification of the address data book by more than one access means in a safe, accurate, and efficient manner without creating undue overhead and network traffic, Johnson, col. 6, lines 1-11.

7. In considering claims 6 and 16, although the AAPA shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to show: permitting changing requests from the first access means in the event that a second guide display is displayed on other devices.

Nevertheless, Johnson teaches: permitting data changing requests from the first access means in the event that the data is being displayed on other devices, (col. 6, lines 36-39).

Thus, given the teachings of Johnson, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the AAPA to show permitting address data book changing requests from the first access means in the event that a second guide display is being displayed on a display of other devices. This would have made the address book data available for viewing and modifying by multiple devices in a distributed processing environment, in a safe, accurate, and efficient manner without creating undue overhead and network traffic, Johnson, col. 6, lines 1-11.

8. In considering claims 7 and 17, the AAPA discloses the address book storing addresses corresponding to multiple communication protocols for each destination. See page 1, lines 21-25, and page 2, lines 1-3.

9. In considering claims 8 and 18, the AAPA discloses a means for accessing data of the address book in response to WWW server function requests from the remote devices. See page 1, lines 16-20.

10. In considering claims 27 and 28 Johnson teaches a computer-readable storage medium storing the computer program. See Fig. 5.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (571) 272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER